

The good news is that the remaining \$370 million of our population assistance must either go to sovereign countries or NGOs that practice genuine family planning and not abortion.

Mr. Chairman, American taxpayers do not want their money going to groups that advertise themselves as family planners but in fact are performers and promoters of abortion around the world. Let us not forget, just a month ago there was a Los Angeles Times poll. It found that among all the women in the United States, when asked the question about abortion, 61 percent, of all women said that abortion was murder.

We hope through this legislation to put a very modest but necessary wall of separation between abortion and family planning, and restrict most U.S. funding of the abortion industry overseas.

Another part of the compromise, Mr. Chairman, transfers \$12.5 million to high-impact child survival programs if the President authorizes money for the abortion groups. This provision will have a direct impact on saving children's lives. It will be spent on immunizations for polio and diphtheria, oral rehydration therapy for children at risk of death from diarrhea, and other easily preventable and treatable diseases that currently kill hundreds of thousands of children annually in developing countries.

In other words, this is a moderate, reasonable compromise in which each side gets something but each side also has to give something up.

Frankly, some of us on the pro-life side had seriously considered offering the original Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy. I certainly wanted to do it. I've done so each year since the mid-sixties. But the fact that this is current law—a sustainable compromise—we felt on balance was the best way to proceed. Again, this is a compromise.

This moderate amendment, Mr. Chairman, is already in the bill offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). So everyone understands the process, the effect of the Greenwood amendment would be to allow unlimited funding of international abortionists and the abortion lobbyists.

Indeed, the amendment would not only strike the pro-life restrictions, it would eliminate the \$385 million cap on U.S. spending for population assistance. This means that the administration could use any amount it wanted from the \$1.3 billion development assistance account for taxpayer subsidies to the international abortion industry.

Mr. Chairman, advocates of international abortion rights have once again dredged up the tired old argument that the Mexico City policy is a gag rule that violates free speech. But even if U.S. constitutional provisions applied to foreign organizations doing business on foreign soil, and the U.S. Supreme Court has said that they do not, the fact of the matter is free

speech would not give these organizations a right to Federal dollars.

Organizations that represent the United States in foreign countries are analogous to our ambassadors. They are our people on the ground. They are surrogates for U.S. foreign policy. Their advocacy in these countries on issues closely related to the U.S. programs they administer, as well as to their other activities, such as the actual performance of abortions, is highly relevant to whether they can effectively administer these programs.

The United States, I would submit, has no obligation to administer these programs through agents who fundamentally disagree with this goal. For the same reason that we would not hire casino lobbyists to run international anti-gambling campaigns, or a distillery to run an anti-alcohol campaign, it makes no sense to hire abortionists or abortion lobbyists to run programs that they claim are aimed at reducing abortions.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying supporters of the Greenwood amendment argue that our family planning grantees should be allowed to perform and promote abortion so long as their abortion-related activities are carried out with "their own money" rather than U.S. grant money.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bookkeeping trick. It ignores the fact that money is indeed fungible, and that when we subsidize an organization we inevitably enrich and empower all of its activities, as well as enhancing the domestic and international prestige of the organization by giving an official U.S. seal of approval.

Let me be clear on the important point: The Mexico City policy does not weaken international family planning programs. On the contrary, it strengthens them by ensuring that U.S. funds are directed to those groups that provide family planning but do not perform or promote abortion.

I urge a strong "no" on the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished ranking member of this committee and a fighter for human rights and freedom around the world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me, and for her great leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood-Lowe amendment. I call upon our colleagues to vote for the motion to strike the restrictions in the bill because they erect barriers to the promotion of civil society abroad, the enhancement of women's participation in the political process, and the credibility of the U.S. in the international arena.

International family planning enables women and families throughout

the world to make key choices affecting the quality of their lives and their future. Each year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes, more than one woman every minute every day. So I support the move to strike those restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, I want to use the rest of my time to say what is not stricken in the bill, because I think it is very important for Members to know that what is still in the bill, which is law, states "Provided further that none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning, or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortion, and that in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to or information about, access to a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning shall meet the following requirements:"

It goes on to reiterate that no Federal dollars may ever be used for the performance of abortion abroad. These prohibitions are still contained in the bill. The motion to strike is strictly about the gag rule which, as I mentioned, erects barriers to women's full participation in the political process and the promotion of civil society abroad.

I offer that language because we have had questions about how far this strike was. It certainly does not strike the basic law. I urge our colleagues to support this very important amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make simply three points. First of all, under no circumstances can American dollars be used to fund abortions abroad, period. No matter what anyone implies on this floor, that is the law of the United States of America and it cannot happen.

However, I am stunned that representatives in this democracy would stand up on the floor and advocate that our policy be to force citizens of another country to break their own laws. That is simply unheard of and unconscionable.

If in another country abortion is legal and referral to people who can do abortions is legal, then we should not force native citizens of that country not to be allowed to say to a woman who comes in where they can go to get an abortion if it is a legal medical procedure in their country and they have a right to it.

Why would we in a free society want to force, as a consequence of American aid, citizens in other countries to abrogate their own laws? Have we no respect?